

OPTION ONE | SWISS CHARD



- | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | Grand pedestrian entrance to park | | Park Ave sidewalk & parallel parking |
| | Potential agriculture area | | Conceptual Pavilion & Washroom Building |
| | Boardwalk with view deck, signage & benches | | Nature playground (all ages) |
| | Trail with signage & benches | | Existing heritage fruit & nut trees to be protected & preserved where possible |
| | Agricultural area | | Affordable housing site |

Advantages

- Can accommodate more townhouse units to house more people, achieve the “Suburban Neighbourhood” land use objectives, and may allow more economically viable development.
- Allows for circulation and driveway access options from both Park Avenue and Boardwalk Avenue.
- Allows housing units to front onto Park Avenue in compliance with Development Permit guidelines, and consistent with the existing streetscape and siting of houses along Park Avenue.
- Allows space to ensure the development does not impact the wetland, and can avoid the existing sanitary sewer main.

Disadvantages

- Least area available overall for public park use.
- Less agriculture area along Park Avenue frontage.

OPTION TWO | BEET



- | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | Grand pedestrian entrance to park | | Park Ave sidewalk & parallel parking |
| | Potential agriculture area | | Conceptual Pavilion & Washroom Building |
| | Boardwalk with view deck, signage & benches | | Nature playground (all ages) |
| | Trail with signage & benches | | Existing heritage fruit & nut trees to be protected & preserved where possible |
| | Agricultural area | | Affordable housing site |

Advantages

- Allows for more space for public park use.
- Allows for circulation and driveway access options from both Park Avenue and Boardwalk Avenue.
- Allows for the housing units to front onto Park Avenue in compliance with Development Permit guidelines, and consistent with the existing streetscape and siting of houses along Park Avenue.
- Developable area does not affect the wetland, may allow for protection of more heritage trees, and avoids the existing sanitary sewer line.

Disadvantages

- May not allow for an economically viable housing development given potential servicing, site and building construction costs.
- Less agriculture area along Park Avenue frontage.

OPTION THREE | APPLE



NANAIMO
THE MARSHALL POINT
EDS



- | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | Grand pedestrian entrance to park | | Park Ave sidewalk & parallel parking |
| | Potential agriculture area | | Conceptual Pavilion & Washroom Building |
| | Boardwalk with view deck, signage & benches | | Nature playground (all ages) |
| | Trail with signage & benches | | Existing heritage fruit & nut trees to be protected & preserved where possible |
| | Agricultural area | | Affordable housing site |

Advantages

- Driveway access would likely be from Boardwalk Avenue only, consistent with the City's Engineering standards.
- Developable area may allow for protection of more heritage trees.

Disadvantages

- May not allow for an economically viable housing development given potential servicing, site and building construction costs.
- Public park area is less integrated.
- Does not allow for street presence for the housing units as recommended by Development Permit guidelines.
- Due to the limited road frontage, more area onsite may be needed for driveway and emergency vehicle circulation.

OPTION FOUR | RASPBERRY



- | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | Grand pedestrian entrance to park | | Park Ave sidewalk & parallel parking |
| | Potential agriculture area | | Conceptual Pavilion & Washroom Building |
| | Boardwalk with view deck, signage & benches | | Nature playground (all ages) |
| | Trail with signage & benches | | Existing heritage fruit & nut trees to be protected & preserved where possible |
| | Agricultural area | | Affordable housing site |

Advantages

- Driveway access would likely be from Boardwalk Avenue only, consistent with the City's Engineering standards.
- Developable area may allow for protection of more heritage trees.

Disadvantages

- May not allow for an economically viable housing development given potential servicing, site and building construction costs.
- Road construction would be required to build 'future road' along the north property line (however this road will be needed anyway in future).
- Does not allow for street presence for the housing units on Park Avenue, as recommended by Development Permit guidelines.
- Developable area may be impacted by proximity to the wetland and existing sanitary sewer line.

OPTION FIVE | CARROT



- | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| | Grand pedestrian entrance to park | | Park Ave sidewalk & parallel parking |
| | Potential agriculture area | | Conceptual Pavilion & Washroom Building |
| | Boardwalk with view deck, signage & benches | | Nature playground (all ages) |
| | Trail with signage & benches | | Agricultural area and/or future recreation/open space |
- Existing heritage fruit & nut trees to be protected & preserved where possible

Advantages

- Would fully devote property to productive landscape, nature park, and future recreational use.
- Site would not be impacted by development related site and utility upgrades that could be triggered by the affordable housing development.
- Allows more agricultural area along Park Avenue frontage.

Disadvantages

- May require reallocation of City funding used for property acquisition due to removal of affordable housing element.
- Missed opportunity for new affordable housing in close proximity to an elementary school in the Harewood neighbourhood.